

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

APPELLANT:	Y. Sawada	CONF. NO.:	3720
U.S. SERIAL NO.:	10/049,315	EXAMINER:	K. Stork
FILED:	February 8, 2002	GROUP:	2178
FOR:	ELECTRONIC BOOK CONTENTS RECORDING MEDIUM WITH ELECTRONIC BOOK CONTENTS RECORDED THEREON, ELECTRONIC BOOK TRANSMISSION APPARATUS AND ELECTRONIC BOOK DISPLAY APPARATUS		

Mail Stop Appeal Brief—Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REPLY BRIEF TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Sir:

The following is in reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed February 20, 2008, in connection with the appeal of the above-referenced application.

This Reply Brief is being filed within two months of the mailing date of the Examiner's Answer. As such, this Reply Brief should be considered timely filed.

The following responds to remarks made in the "Response to Argument" section on pages 12-14 of the Examiner's Answer regarding the arguments included in the Appellant's Appeal Brief filed on November 25, 2007.

In response to Appellant's argument that the History document does not teach or suggest "a body data unit and a part data unit" as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 15, 17, and 18, the Examiner alleged that the <BODY> tag in the History document "is not analogous to the claimed body data unit" (see page 12 of Examiner's Answer).

Further, on page 3, last paragraph of the Examiner's Answer, it was stated: "History discloses an electronic book contents comprising a body data unit and a part data unit." However, on page 12 of the Examiner's Answer, the opposite conclusion was reached: "History does not teach the applicant's claimed body data unit."

If the History document is viewed as not disclosing a "body data unit," then the History document cannot possibly teach or suggest a "part data unit ... entered as an object separately from said body data unit," since a body data unit would not be present in the History document.

In response to Appellant's argument that the Style document, whether taken alone or in combination with the History document, does not teach or suggest a body data unit that "includes no data to be actually displayed on the display region," the Examiner cited a <LINK> element that links to an external style sheet as disclosed in the Style document, and the Examiner alleged that the <LINK> element corresponds to the claimed "body data unit."

However, as depicted on page 6 of the Style document, the <LINK> element also includes the following title: TITLE="Cool" which in HTML programming is display data. Therefore, if the <LINK> element disclosed on pages 6-7 of the Style document is somehow considered a "body data unit," there is no teaching or suggestion in the Style document that the claimed "body data unit includes no data to be actually displayed on the display region."

Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would not seek to combine a "body data unit" from the Style document with a "part data unit" from the History document, as the History document already contains all of the necessary text and display parameters between the <BODY> and </BODY> tags, which one of ordinary skill in the art would understand to correspond to body data under generally understood HTML programming code. Even if such a combination were attempted, the information pertaining to the <LINK> element in the Style document contains data to be displayed on a display region, and thus the proposed combination would not teach or suggest the following claim limitation: "said body data unit includes no data to be actually displayed on the display region."

There is no fee required for the submission of this Reply Brief. However, if, for any reason, a fee is deemed to be required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

---

Steven M. Jensen  
(Reg. No. 42,693)  
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205

Date: April 18, 2008

Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874